

State of California
Natural Resources Agency
Department of Water Resources
South Central Region Office

Draft
May 2013

GUIDELINES AND PROPOSAL SOLICITATION PACKAGE
for
ON-FARM DRAINAGE MANAGEMENT AND HARVESTING OF SALTS

Drainage Reuse Grant Program

Funded by
PROPOSITION 204, THE CLEAN, SAFE, RELIABLE WATER SUPPLY ACT OF 1996



GUIDELINES AND PROPOSAL SOLICITATION PACKAGE
for
ON-FARM DRAINAGE MANAGEMENT AND HARVESTING OF SALTS

Drainage Reuse Grant Program

The California Department of Water Resources invites you to submit a proposal for funding for On-Farm Drainage Management and Harvesting of Salts through the Drainage Reuse Grant Program.

APPLICATION DUE DATE

September 13, 2013

Must be postmarked no later than September 13, 2013
or received via personal submission by the close of business.

PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL

Submit a complete application by submitting one (1) original complete application marked as "ORIGINAL," four (4) additional copies of the application, and one (1) electronic copy (in MS Word or pdf format) of the original application on a CD to:

California Department of Water Resources
Integrated Regional Water Management
South Central Region Office
3374 E. Shields Avenue
Fresno, California 93726
Attn: Maggie Dutton

NOTICE OF INFORMATIONAL PUBLIC WORKSHOP

Workshop Dates and Locations

Workshop 1	Workshop 2
Modesto Tuesday, June 11, 2013 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. Stanislaus County Agricultural Center 3800 Cornucopia Way, Room HI Modesto, CA 95358	Fresno Thursday, June 13, 2013 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. Department of Water Resources 3374 East Shields Ave Fresno, CA 93726

For more information: Contact Maggie Dutton (559) 230-3303

Margaret.Dutton@water.ca.gov

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GUIDELINES FOR DRAINAGE REUSE GRANT PROGRAM ON-FARM DRAINAGE MANAGEMENT AND HARVESTING OF SALTS	1
I. PURPOSE.....	1
II. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW	1
A. Authority	1
B. Background	1
C. Program Intent/Objectives.....	3
D. Program Strategy and Process	3
III. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.....	3
A. Eligible Projects	3
B. Eligible Applicants.....	4
IV. GRANT AMOUNTS	5
V. REIMBURSEMENT	5
A. Eligible Costs for Reimbursement.....	5
VI. PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS	5
A. General Requirements.....	5
B. Laws and Conflict of Interest.....	5
C. Waiver of Confidentiality	6
D. Labor Code Compliance	6
E. California Environmental Quality Act Compliance	6
VII. PROPOSAL SOLICITATION AND APPLICATION SUBMITTAL.....	7
VIII. REVIEW, EVALUATION, AWARD, AND AGREEMENT PROCESS	7
A. Technical Review Committee.....	7
B. Review.....	7
C. Evaluation.....	8
D. Awards.....	8
E. Grant Agreement	8
PROPOSAL SOLICITATION PACKAGE FOR DRAINAGE REUSE GRANT PROGRAM ON-FARM DRAINAGE MANAGEMENT AND HARVESTING OF SALTS. 9	9
I. AVAILABLE FUNDING, MAXIMUM GRANT AMOUNT, AND COST SHARE	9
II. HOW TO SUBMIT AN APPLICATION.....	9
III. WHAT TO SUBMIT – REQUIRED APPLICATION ATTACHMENTS	10
IV. SCHEDULE.....	10
V. REVIEW AND SCORING CRITERIA.....	10
A. General Scoring Standards.....	11

APPENDIX A – APPLICATION ATTACHMENTS	14
APPENDIX B – WEB LINKS	20

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 - Schedule	10
Table 2 - Scoring Criteria	11

GUIDELINES FOR DRAINAGE REUSE GRANT PROGRAM ON-FARM DRAINAGE MANAGEMENT AND HARVESTING OF SALTS

I. PURPOSE

The purpose of these guidelines is to establish the process and criteria that the Department of Water Resources (DWR) will use to solicit applications, evaluate proposals, and award grants under the Drainage Reuse Grant Program.

These guidelines include the Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP), which contains additional detailed, program-specific information.

II. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

A. Authority

In 1996 the voters of California approved Proposition 204, the Safe, Clean, Reliable Water Supply Act. Section 78645 of the Safe, Clean, Reliable Water Supply Act (Act) of 1996 authorizes that any unallocated funds remaining in the Agricultural Drainage Water Account in the 1986 Water Conservation and Water Quality Fund on November 6, 1996, shall be transferred to the drainage management sub-account and continuously appropriated, without regard to fiscal years, to the Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA). The CDFA will implement programs to develop methods of using drainage water and reducing toxic materials in drainage water through reuse of the water and the use of the remaining salts. Priority shall be given to source reduction projects and programs.

The funds remaining in the account on November 6, 1996, were \$6,177,742. In September 1997, representatives of the CDFA, DWR, and the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) signed a memorandum of understanding to transfer these funds and the responsibility for implementing the programs to DWR. To date, more than 40 projects have been funded, and in April 2013, the funds remaining in the account were approximately \$1.6 million dollars.

B. Background

On-farm drainage demonstration projects that include control of salinity, reduction of selenium, and sequential reuse of drainage water on increasingly salt-tolerant plants have been conducted at several sites in the San Joaquin Valley. Investigations at Red Rock Ranch and Mendota have indicated that it is possible to concentrate the salts by reusing drainage water and harvesting the salts in a solar evaporator. However, the following areas of uncertainty related to long-term technical feasibility, cost of construction, and operation of these systems and their economic and environmental

feasibility have not yet been resolved:

1. Impacts of toxic elements in drainage water on wildlife and appropriate prevention and mitigation measures.
2. Management practices for irrigation, control of drainage water, and selection and management of salt-tolerant and halophytic plant cultures to ensure long-term sustainability of soil/water/plant systems.
3. Impacts of continuous irrigation with high salinity drainage water on leaching requirements, evapotranspiration, soil permeability, infiltration rates, soil compaction, soil salinity, and other chemical and physical properties of soil/water/plant system.
4. Fate and accumulation of salts, selenium, and other toxic elements within agricultural reuse systems.
5. Discharge into solar evaporators may exceed discharge standards in areas where harmful trace element concentrations are high. In these situations, the evaporators must be designed and operated to meet the California Health and Safety Code (HSC) § 25209.12 regulations. Other cost effective means must be developed for harvesting drainage salts that do not harm wildlife and the environment.
6. Market opportunities for salt-tolerant plants, halophytic plants, and trace element accumulating crops.
7. Uses, markets, and technical standards for harvested salt.

Over the past several years, considerable progress has been made (1) in investigation, demonstration, and extension of irrigation management methods to reduce deep percolation, and (2) in drainage management practices to increase the use of shallow groundwater by salt-tolerant commercial crops. Many areas have adopted highly efficient irrigation and drainage management practices as a result of programs to develop more efficient irrigation practices, grower response to water shortages during drought conditions, increases in water costs, and changes required by the agreement for operation of the Grassland Bypass. It is presently unclear which areas would receive significant benefits from additional improvements in irrigation and drainage management practices and what practices should be improved. An investigation that includes interviews with the irrigation and drainage district managers of shallow groundwater areas and contributing upslope areas is needed to focus the activities on areas and practices that will significantly benefit drainage problems in the shallow groundwater areas.

C. Program Intent/Objectives

This program will fulfill the intent of the 1996 Act by giving priority to source reduction projects by paying special attention to the unresolved issues of the 1998 status report of the San Joaquin Valley Drainage Implementation Program (SJVDIP), findings of the technical committees, and any other updated information that is relevant to the intent of the Act. The objectives of this program include the following:

1. Resolve existing uncertainties and demonstrate the technical and economic feasibility, environmental and social acceptability, and cost effectiveness of drainage reuse, reduction of toxic constituents, and salt concentration methods currently under development throughout the drainage problem area as well as other promising technologies for drainage reuse and harvesting salt and selenium.
2. Identify areas where improved irrigation and drainage management technologies are cost effective alternatives for management for controlling agricultural drainage problems, establishing implementation priorities, and targeting demonstration, extension, incentive, and training activities in areas that will yield the most benefits.
3. Identify, investigate, develop, and implement promising new technologies that will facilitate the implementation of the drainage source reduction through productive use of drainage water and/or its constituents.

D. Program Strategy and Process

This program will be conducted by DWR under contract with CDFA. A Technical Review Committee (TRC) will provide technical input to the program. DWR staff will solicit project proposals for review by the TRC. DWR staff will prepare and administer grant agreements and monitor project progress.

III. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

A. Eligible Projects

Examples of research and technical studies that meet the intent of the Act include:

1. Reducing deep percolation through irrigation management practices,
2. Reusing drainage water on salt-tolerant and halophytic plants,
3. Identifying suitable salt-tolerant crops and trees,
4. Developing other opportunities to reuse drainage water,

5. Controlling shallow groundwater levels including the use of salt-tolerant plant systems as biological interceptors and regulating drain flows to encourage uptake of shallow groundwater by salt-tolerant crops,
6. Removing selenium and other toxic elements using trace element accumulating/volatilizing salt-tolerant plants and trees,
7. Developing markets for harvested salts from drainage water,
8. Developing markets for salt-tolerant, halophytic, and trace element accumulating plant products,
9. Reducing drainage water and potentially toxic trace elements by source control,
10. Evaluating the technical and economic feasibility of establishing, operating, and monitoring drainage reduction and reuse systems,
11. Developing sustainable and environmentally acceptable methods to concentrate and harvest salts and potentially toxic elements from drainage water, such as the development of economically viable salt tolerant crops for drainage reuse,
12. Developing viable desalination technologies for subsurface agricultural drainage water and brackish groundwater underlying drainage-impaired lands, and
13. Utilizing concentrate from desalination processes for recycling of valuable salts, such as gypsum, sodium sulfate, magnesium and calcium chlorides, etc.

Several projects have been funded and successfully completed in the areas of examples (1)-(10).

Additional work is needed in the topics described by examples (11)-(13). Thus, in this round of funding, preference will be given to projects that develop sustainable and environmentally acceptable methods to concentrate and harvest salts and potentially toxic elements from drainage water; develop viable desalination technologies for subsurface agricultural drainage water and brackish groundwater underlying drainage-impaired lands; or use concentrate from desalination processes for recycling of valuable salts, such as gypsum, sodium sulfate, magnesium and calcium chlorides, etc.

B. Eligible Applicants

An eligible applicant for a Drainage Reuse Grant must be a local public agency, as defined by California Water Code § 78640(b). Examples of local public agencies include cities, counties, districts, joint powers authorities, universities, or other political subdivisions of the state involved with water management.

IV. GRANT AMOUNTS

Grant funding will be provided to eligible grant recipients to develop and to implement projects that meet the requirements of these guidelines. Eligibility requirements are described in Section IV.

The proposed budget for State fiscal year (FY) 2013-2014 is \$750,000 (this budget is subject to change). The proposed budget for FY 2014-2015 is the uncommitted funds remaining in the account at the end of FY 2013-2014 (June 30, 2014). If there are not enough eligible projects, the funds will be carried over to the following year.

The maximum grant amount that will be awarded to an eligible grant recipient for a particular project will be limited to \$200,000 per project. Applicants may submit applications for multiple projects, but each project is limited to a maximum grant amount of \$200,000. These maximum grant amounts are intended to allow the distribution of available funds among multiple eligible projects, when applicable. The project time limit is two (2) years.

V. REIMBURSEMENT

A. Eligible Costs for Reimbursement

Reimbursable costs include the reasonable costs of engineering, design, land and easement, legal fees, preparation of environmental documentation, environmental mitigation, and project implementation including administrative costs and incidental costs. For the Drainage Reuse Grant Program, only costs incurred during the term of the grant agreement will be eligible for reimbursement. Advance funds cannot be provided.

VI. PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

A. General Requirements

DWR shall develop a new PSP for each funding cycle and will only consider those applications received as part of the solicitation for each funding cycle. (California Public Resources Code (PRC) § 75100(a).) Therefore, an applicant will be required to submit a new application for each funding cycle. (*Ibid.*)

B. Laws and Conflict of Interest

All participants are subject to State and federal conflict of interest laws. Failure to comply with these laws, including business and financial disclosure provisions, will result in the application being rejected and any subsequent grant agreement being declared void. Other legal action may also be taken. Before submitting an application, applicants are urged to seek legal counsel regarding conflict of interest requirements.

Applicable statutes include, but are not limited to, California Government Code §1090 and California Public Contract Code §10410 and §10411.

C. Waiver of Confidentiality

Once the proposal has been submitted to DWR, any privacy rights, as well as other confidentiality protections, afforded by law with respect to the proposal application package will be waived.

D. Labor Code Compliance

The funding recipient will be required to keep informed of and take all measures necessary to ensure compliance with applicable California Labor Code (CLC) requirements, including, but not limited to, Section 1720 *et seq.* of the CLC regarding public works, limitations on use of volunteer labor (California Labor Code Section 1720.4), labor compliance programs (CLC Section 1771.5) and payment of prevailing wages for work done and funded pursuant to these guidelines, including any payments to the Department of Industrial Relations under CLC Section 1771.3. A Grantee's failure to comply with CLC requirements may be considered a breach of the Grant Agreement. At the State's request, the Grantee must promptly submit written evidence of Grantee's compliance with the CLC requirements. Please refer to the California Department of Industrial Relations website listed in Appendix B for more information.

E. California Environmental Quality Act Compliance

Activities funded under Proposition 204 must be in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). (PRC § 21000 *et seq.*) Project sponsors will be required to prepare and circulate an environmental document prior to final funding approval by DWR. As a grantor, DWR acts as a responsible agency under CEQA and makes its own findings on the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project. As a responsible agency, DWR relies on the analysis completed by the lead CEQA agency as the basis for making its findings, but conducts its own independent analysis in that capacity.

The analysis of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions was added to the CEQA Guidelines by the Natural Resources Agency on December 30, 2009, and became effective March 18, 2010. To comply with current CEQA Guidelines (effective March 2010) regarding GHG analysis, a lead agency's final CEQA document must include an analysis of GHG emissions and a Determination of Significance. As a responsible agency under CEQA, DWR must evaluate the impact of climate change-causing GHG emissions for a proposed project in exercising its discretion to give final approval for a grant.

Any grant, which provides funding prior to completion of required environmental documentation, must include language which provides an opportunity for DWR to

review the project after CEQA compliance is completed and to decide whether to continue to fund the project.

See Appendix B for web links to CEQA information and the State Clearinghouse Handbook. For an example of what DWR considers to be adequate GHG analysis, project sponsors should refer to the DWR document "[Informal Guidance for DWR Grantees: GHG Assessment for CEQA Purposes](#)," which provides an overview of DWR's role as a responsible agency in review of CEQA documents related to grant-funded projects and lays out the process DWR has established internally for analyzing GHG emissions and assessing significance.

VII. PROPOSAL SOLICITATION AND APPLICATION SUBMITTAL

DWR will solicit proposals with a Drainage Reuse Grant Program PSP. The PSP provides detailed instructions on the mechanics of submitting proposals and specific information on submittal requirements. The PSP is included with this document (see page 9). Also, the PSP will be available on the DWR website at:

<http://www.water.ca.gov/drainage>

VIII. REVIEW, EVALUATION, AWARD, AND AGREEMENT PROCESS

A. Technical Review Committee

The TRC will be a panel comprised of representatives from the staff of SJVDPIP agencies and selected representatives of universities, consultants, or stakeholders. The members of the TRC will be the primary reviewers of the project proposals and additionally serve to evaluate program progress, help resolve difficult technical issues, and help identify program goals and objectives. Each member of the TRC will review proposals and will make recommendations to take one of three actions; (1) approve the proposal, (2) approve the proposal with modification, or (3) reject the proposal. TRC members will disclose potential conflicts of interest in any proposals and will disqualify themselves from commenting on any proposals that represent a conflict of interest. All TRC members will agree to these provisions in writing. DWR, CDFA, and SWRCB senior level staff review TRC comments and recommendations, and ultimately submit TRC recommendations for funding to the DWR oversight committee, comprised of supervisory-level management. TRC meetings can be held to review project proposals as necessary.

B. Review

All applications will undergo eligibility and completeness review for the required items listed in the PSP. If an application is determined to be ineligible or incomplete, the

application will not be reviewed or considered for funding.

All eligible and complete grant applications will undergo a technical evaluation. Project proposals will be submitted to members of the TRC for review. Technical reviewers on the TRC will individually evaluate and score the proposals in accordance with the Scoring Criteria contained in Section V of the PSP. Following completion of the individual technical reviews, the reviewers will discuss the proposal and develop a consensus evaluation and score. After completion of the consensus review, DWR senior level staff and management will review and finalize evaluations and scores, then develop a preliminary ranking. The draft funding recommendations will be posted on DWR's website for public review and comment. DWR management will consider the TRC's recommendations and the public review comments and will make the final determination on which applicants will receive a Drainage Reuse Grant.

C. Evaluation

An application for a Drainage Reuse Grant will be evaluated on all of the information required in the PSP and in accordance with the Scoring Criteria in the PSP.

D. Awards

Based on the individual evaluations of each proposal, the preliminary ranking list and initial funding recommendations developed by the TRC and DWR management's recommendations, DWR's Deputy Director will approve draft funding recommendations, which will be released for public review and comment. The draft funding recommendations will be posted on DWR's website. After consideration of public comments and following approval by the DWR Director, the selected grant recipients will receive a commitment letter officially notifying them of their selection and the grant amount. An Environmental Information Form (EIF) will accompany the commitment letter.

E. Grant Agreement

Following funding commitment, DWR will execute a grant agreement with the grant recipient. Grant agreements are not executed until signed by the authorized representative of the grant recipient and DWR. DWR's concurrence with the Lead Agency's CEQA documents is fully discretionary and shall constitute a condition precedent to any work for which it is required.

As part of the grant agreement, a grant recipient will be required to provide information regarding its project for Bond Accountability reporting purposes.

PROPOSAL SOLICITATION PACKAGE FOR DRAINAGE REUSE GRANT PROGRAM ON-FARM DRAINAGE MANAGEMENT AND HARVESTING OF SALTS

This Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) has been completed in tandem with the attached Guidelines for the Drainage Reuse Grant Program. The PSP contains information on the Drainage Reuse Grant Program; detailed application (proposal) submittal requirements; the proposal review, evaluation, and grant approval process; and the grant program schedule. A complete application must be received by DWR no later than 5 p.m. on **September 13, 2013**. Applications and supporting documentation received after this time will not be reviewed or considered for funding.

I. AVAILABLE FUNDING, MAXIMUM GRANT AMOUNT, AND COST SHARE

A total of approximately \$750,000 in funding from Proposition 204 is available for the Fiscal Year (FY) 2013-2014 Drainage Reuse Grant Program. The maximum grant amount that will be awarded to an eligible grant recipient for a particular project will be limited to \$200,000 per project. Applicants may submit applications for multiple projects, but each project is limited to a maximum grant amount of \$200,000. No cost share is required; however, grantees are required to show cost share (e.g., federal, local, or other funds or in-kind services) if an awarded project costs more than the grant amount.

II. HOW TO SUBMIT AN APPLICATION

A completed proposal package must be received by DWR no later than 5:00 p.m. on **September 13, 2013**. All forms, attachments, and supporting documentation described in this PSP must be submitted together at one time. **Applications and supporting documentation received after this time will be returned to the applicant.**

Applications may be found on the following DWR web site:

<http://www.water.ca.gov/drainage>

Applicants must submit:

One (1) complete application marked as "ORIGINAL," four additional copies of the application, and one (1) electronic copy (in MS Word or pdf format) of the original application on a CD.

Submit all information by mail to:

California Department of Water Resources
South Central Region Office
3374 E. Shields Avenue
Fresno, CA 93726
Attn: Maggie Dutton

III. WHAT TO SUBMIT – REQUIRED APPLICATION ATTACHMENTS

A completed application includes the following:

- Part A - Organizational, Financial, and Legal Information
- Part B - Project Proposal and Task Breakdown

IV. SCHEDULE

The schedule below shows the timeline from release of this PSP through awarding of grants. Any updates to the schedule will be posted on the DWR website at:

<http://www.water.ca.gov/drainage>

Updates may also be publicized through e-mail announcements and news releases.

Table 1 - Schedule	
Milestone or Activity	Date
Post draft Guidelines/PSP on website (at least 30 days)	5/10/13 - 6/26/13
Hold two public workshops on draft Guidelines/PSP	6/11/13 (Modesto) 6/13/13 (Fresno)
Public comment period on draft Guidelines/PSP	6/11/13 - 6/26/13
Respond to public comments on draft Guidelines/PSP	6/27/13 - 7/12/13
Final Guidelines/PSP released to public	7/15/13
Public to prepare grant applications	7/15/13 - 9/13/13
Select panel to serve on Technical Review Committee (TRC)	August 2013
Applications due to the Department of Water Resources	9/13/13
TRC Kick-off Meeting	9/17/13
Applications mailed to TRC for evaluation	9/18/13 - 9/23/13
Review of Applications	9/24/13 - 11/8/13
Complete Recommendations of Project Rankings	11/14/13
Request approval to release draft funding recommendations	11/15/13
Post draft funding recommendations on DWR website	11/20/13
Public comment period on draft funding recommendations	11/20/13 - 12/4/13
Respond to public comments on draft funding recommendations	12/5/13 - 12/13/13
Post final funding recommendations on website and send letters of commitment to grantees	12/20/13
Begin funding contract process	1/6/14

V. REVIEW AND SCORING CRITERIA

Applications will first be screened for eligibility and completeness in accordance with Sections III and VI of the Guidelines and Section III of this PSP. All complete and eligible applications will then be evaluated as described below.

The application will be scored based only on what is contained in the application. DWR does not allow reviewers to add or fill in information in an application during review, regardless of knowledge of the proposal.

Table 2 - Scoring Criteria	
Part A	
A-1 Application Cover Sheet	Pass/Fail
A-2 Applicant's Representatives	Pass/Fail
A-3 Cost Estimate/Cost Share	Pass/Fail
A-4 Authorizing Resolution	Pass/Fail
Total Possible Maximum – Criteria A	Pass
Part B	
B Project Proposal and Task Breakdown	(1) 5 points, (2) 15 points, (3) 5 points
Total Possible Maximum – Criteria B	25 Points, Fund (High Priority)

The scoring sheet that will be used is shown below. Technical reviewers will evaluate Part B using this scoring sheet and assign scores according to the General Scoring Standards below. The assigned score will then be multiplied by the weighting factor noted on the scoring sheet and summed for a total score to be assigned to the application.

A. General Scoring Standards

- A score of 5 points will be awarded where the criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation.
- A score of 4 points will be awarded where the criterion is addressed but is not thoroughly documented.
- A score of 3 points will be awarded where the criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient.
- A score of 2 points will be awarded where the criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient.
- A score of 1 point will be awarded where the criterion is minimally addressed and not documented.
- A score of 0 points will be awarded where the criterion is not addressed.

**Prop 204 Drainage Reuse Grant Program for
On-Farm Drainage Management and Harvesting of Salts
FY 2013-14 Proposal Review Form**

Proposal:

Title: _____

PI(s): _____

Campus: _____

Criteria for Evaluation:

1. Relevance to the Drainage Reuse Program and Salt Separation/Recycling/Recovery

Does the project address the stated program priority? Which of the following is addressed by the proposed project: (a) develop sustainable and environmentally acceptable methods to concentrate and harvest salts and potentially toxic elements from drainage water; (b) develop viable desalination technologies for subsurface agricultural drainage water and brackish groundwater underlying drainage-impaired lands; or (c) use concentrate from desalination processes for recycling of valuable salts, such as gypsum, sodium sulfate, magnesium and calcium chlorides, etc.? Is the research integrated and necessary to address the problem or issue?

(Weighting Factor: 1, Range of Points Possible: 0-5, Score: 0-5)

2. Scientific Merits (hypothesis, methods, and anticipated outcomes)

Are the project objectives and outcomes clearly described, adequate, and appropriate? Are the proposed approach, procedures, or methodologies innovative, original, clearly described, suitable, and feasible? Are the expected results or outcomes clearly stated, measurable, and achievable within the allotted time frame? Does the proposed research fill knowledge gaps that are critical to the development of practices and programs to address the stated problem or issue?

(Weighting Factor: 3, Range of Points Possible: 0-5, Score: 0-15)

(Continued Criteria 2 Discussion...)

3. Other Comments (qualification of the investigators, budget, equipment, schedule, etc.)

Are the roles of key personnel clearly defined? Do key personnel have sufficient expertise to complete the proposed project, and, where appropriate, are there established partnerships with other institutions? Has evidence of institutional capacity and competence in the proposed area of work been provided? Will sufficient personnel, facilities, and instrumentation be provided? Is a clear plan for project management articulated, which includes: (1) adequate time allocation for attainment of objectives and delivery of products, (2) maintenance of partnerships and collaborations, and (3) a strategy to enhance communication, data sharing, and reporting among members of the project team?)

(Weighting Factor: 1, Range of Points Possible: 0-5, Score: 0-5)

4. Cost sharing (Is there a cost-share component to the project?)

(Bonus/tiebreaker point = 1. This point will be significant only if the project score is near the cutoff for funding.)

Funding Recommendations:

Fund?

☐ YES ☐ NO

Priority?

☐ LOW ☐ MEDIUM ☐ HIGH ☐ NONE

APPENDIX A – APPLICATION ATTACHMENTS

Part A - Organizational, Financial, and Legal Information

Please provide (as Attachment A) the following documentation:

1. Application Cover Sheet (A-1),
2. Applicant's Representatives (A-2),
3. Cost Estimate/Cost Share (A-3), and
4. Authorizing Resolution (A-4).

A-1 Application Cover Sheet

Application for a grant under § 78645 of the Clean, Safe, Reliable Water Supply Act of 1996

The

(Exact legal name of local entity applying for the grant)

Of

(Mailing address of local entity)

Of the County of _____, State of California, does hereby apply to the California Department of Water Resources for a grant in the amount of \$_____.

For the following project under the Drainage Reuse Grant Program of the Safe, Reliable Water Supply Act of 1996:

(Specify project title)

By _____ Date _____
(Signature of authorized representative)

(Print or type name of authorized representative)

Title _____

Telephone (_____) _____

Fax (_____) _____

E-mail _____

A-2 Applicant's Representatives

Project contact person: Name _____
Title _____
Telephone(_____) _____
FAX (_____) _____
E-mail _____

Alternate contact person: Name _____
Title _____
Telephone(_____) _____
FAX (_____) _____
E-mail _____

Type of Organization: _____
(City, County, water district, university, etc.)

Attach a copy of the applicant's charter and the names and titles of its officers.

A-3 Cost Estimate/Cost Share

Provide financing information about the proposed project.

		% of Total Cost
Total cost:	\$ _____	
Amount to be funded under § 78645:	\$ _____	_____
Amount of local cost share ⁽¹⁾ :	\$ _____	_____
Amount to be funded by the applicant:	\$ _____	_____
In-kind contribution	\$ _____	_____
Amount to be funded by others: (Describe below in table.)	\$ _____	_____

Sources of funds from partner agencies for this project, if applicable:

Amount	Name of source	Status of funds ⁽²⁾
\$		
\$		
\$		
\$		
Total: \$		

Notes:

1. No cost share is required; however, grantees are required to show cost share (e.g., federal, local, or other funds) if an awarded project costs more than the grant amount.
2. Identify the current status of funds: available, planned/budgeted, awarded or pending.

A-4 Authorizing Resolution

Include a resolution adopted by the applicant's governing body authorizing the application for a grant under this program and designating a representative to sign the application. Following is a suggested format.

Resolution No. _____

Resolved by the _____
(Governing body, city council or other)

of the _____
(Name of applicant)

that pursuant to all of the terms and provisions of the Clean, Safe, Reliable Water Supply Act of 1996, application by this

_____ be made to the California Department of
(“Agency”, “city”, “county”, or other)

Water Resources to obtain a grant for _____
(Project title)

The _____ of the
(Presiding officer, president, city manager, or other official)

_____ is hereby authorized and directed to
(“Agency”, “city”, “county”, or other)

prepare the necessary data, make investigations, sign, and file such application with the California Department of Water Resources.

Passed and adopted at a regular meeting of the _____
(Board of Directors, Supervisors, etc.)

of the _____
(Name of applicant)

on _____
(Date)

Part B – Project Proposal and Task Breakdown

Please provide (as Attachment B) a project proposal with a detailed task breakdown, which describes the tasks that will be undertaken to implement the project. The project proposal shall include the following:

1. Title
2. Principal Investigator/Cooperator(s)
 - Please name all cooperators, including consultants.
3. Description of the Problem
4. Quantifiable Project Objectives
5. Project-Specific Tasks

The task breakdown shall include, at a minimum, the following elements:

- A description of the tasks required to complete the project. In the description of each task, include the identification and cost of each item of work (from the cost estimate) that is included in the task.
 - Preparation of quarterly progress reports.
 - A time schedule for implementing the project, including the proposed calendar dates. At a minimum, the schedule should include the following benchmarks:
 - Each quarterly progress report.
 - Completion of each task of the task breakdown.
 - Review of implementation by DWR.
 - Completion of post-implementation report.
 - A time schedule of expenditures.
 - Signature of the agency head or designated representative, certifying that the agency approves the task breakdown, or a resolution or minute order delegating responsibility for task breakdown approval to the signer.
6. Materials and Methods
 7. Schedule
 8. Costs
 - Budget sheet, including indirect costs and cost sharing (if applicable).
 9. Deliverable Products

APPENDIX B – WEB LINKS

DWR	
Home Page	http://www.water.ca.gov/
Grants And Loan Information	http://www.water.ca.gov/nav/nav.cfm?loc=t&id=103
Drainage Funding (Proposition 204)	http://www.water.ca.gov/drainage/
CEQA Information	
Environmental Information	http://ceres.ca.gov/index.html
State Clearinghouse Handbook	http://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/SCH_Handbook_2009.pdf
Informal Guidance For DWR Grantees: GHG Assessment For CEQA Purposes	http://www.water.ca.gov/climatechange/docs/Guidance%20For%20Grantees-%20Calculating%20GHGs%20for%20CEQA2011.pdf
Frequently Asked Questions: CEQA Process For DWR Grant Programs	http://www.water.ca.gov/climatechange/docs/CEQA-GHG%20FAQs%20Final2011.pdf
Other Information	
California Department Of Industrial Relations	http://www.dir.ca.gov/